Model Validation & Evaluation: With Whom Lies Responsibility?

Dr. Tom Philp Oasis Insight May 2023



New Venture: Maximum Vacuums (MaxVacs) MaxVacs offers a new vacuum cleaner to the household market - it's a great day for everyone. • Various statements are now being made: • ?? has confirmed that the vacuum creates continuous suction MAXVACS VERIFICATION MAXVACS <u>AND</u> ??? has confirmed the suction is sufficiently strong to serve the primary aim of MaxVacs' target market. **REGULATOR** VALIDATION DICKIE WHITAKER -??? has confirmed that the suction is sufficient to pick up pet hair from their £200k Afghan rug MAXVACS AND • ??? has quantified that the vacuum collects 20% more pet hair than the current leading vacuum on the market RICHARD DIXON

EVALUATION

- STEVE JEWSON -??> has quantified that the vacuum performs 50% worse at picking up everyday household dust
- MATT DONOVAN ??> has proven that the vacuum picks up <99% of the elephant dung at the local zoo

Definitions & Responsibilities

- We desperately need rigour around <u>definitions</u> and <u>responsibilities</u> in the cat model market – vendors, regulators and users can all help.
- My personal feelings:
 - VERIFICATION should be done by **vendors**.
 - "GLOBAL" VALIDATION should be done by vendors and regulators but only for an idealised/average user in the target market.
 - "LOCAL" VALIDATION should be done by **all users (with regulator confirmation)** for their specific use cases.
 - VALIDATION criteria should be set by regulators <u>and</u> independent, risk literate experts.
 - VALIDATION by vendors should be produced in a way that allows user-based inter-comparative evaluations to be carried out (note – this is almost always impossible at present).
 - EVALUATION done by vendors is **always** likely to have a marketing slant.
 - EVALUATION should have measurable, worth-based output, VALIDATION should be pass vs fail output.
 - KEY TAKEAWAY: Dickie, Matt, Richard and Steve all moonlight as vacuum cleaner testers.